

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15-26 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The title was objected to for not being descriptive. The title has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

The specification was objected to for failing to clearly disclose what process was implementing the "steps." The specification has been amended to more clearly emphasize that the steps are being implemented by an enlarged display program. The processing flow diagrams are disclosed as being flow diagrams of the enlarged display program.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections to the title and specification are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.



Upon a detailed review of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejections, there are four different arguments recited by the Office Action.

In the first argument, the Office Action recites that the specification fails to disclose how the claimed "intended area" is opened with a first magnification and is then changed to a second magnification, citing page 5, lines 35-37, of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that the specification, page 12, lines 17-32, and page 13, lines 9-15, fully discloses this feature. By way of review, the enlarged display program enlarges the size of the window in accordance with the designated magnification rate. The then program determines whether the enlarged window can be displayed on the screen. If the window is too large, then the magnification rate is reduced. If, on the other hand, the window is not as large as the screen, then the magnification rate is increased to fill up the whole screen with the window.

In the second argument, the Office Action recites that the specification fails to support the "means for correcting the claimed second magnification upward and downward," citing page 10, lines 14-35, of the specification. However, it is respectfully submitted that the specification, page 14, lines 7-28, fully discloses this feature. The magnification rate is determined such that the character in the window is the same size as the character outside the window, thus the original



magnification rate is corrected to the determined magnification rate.

In the third argument, the Office Action recites that the specification fails to disclose how the "determining means" determines a second magnification rate based on the first magnification rate, the size of said intended area as displayed on the screen, and a specified size when said detection means detects that a request for opening said intended area is issued. The specification, page 10, lines 10-35, discloses three aspects of the claimed determining means. As an example, the specification, in pages 13-15, fully discloses these features as set out in claim 7. The magnification rate is read from the environment-setting data, and a character on the screen is enlarged to that magnification rate. Further, Page 13, lines 26-31, disclose the claimed "size of the character in said intended area as displayed on the screen." Page 14, lines 1-16 particularly disclose the claimed "a specified character size when said detection means detects that a request for opening said intended area is issued."

In the fourth argument, the Office Action recites that the specification fails to clearly disclose the description of the prohibition means, citing page 16, lines 11-18, of the specification. The specification, in page 19, lines 15-32 and page 3, lines 6-15, fully disclose this feature. The prior art scrolling may erroneously allow a user to continue to scroll out



of a window viewing area. The present invention solves this problem by prohibiting the user from scrolling beyond the window's limits.

Claims 2, 10, and 15-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly differentiate between the size of the intended area as displayed on the screen, and the size assigned to said intended area. Claims 10 and 15-26 have been amended to remove the antecedent informalities.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Warnock et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,634,064.

By way of review, the presently claimed invention sets forth a method and apparatus for enlarging a display on a screen. A user designates an area of the screen for enlargement. The area includes images or characters. A user may then request opening an intended area (window) anew and display the images or characters in an enlarged form, i.e., at a second magnification size. The second magnification size is dependent on the size of the original images or characters, the size of the intended area if it was to be displayed on the screen, and the size previously assigned to the intended area to be enlarged on the screen. Thereafter, the intended area is displayed on the screen in an



enlarged form, according to the second magnification rate. In Addition, the presently claimed invention sets forth a scrolling prohibition feature. A user may be prohibited from scrolling beyond the extent of intended area window.

The first magnification rate represents an enlarged viewing of the screen and the second magnification rate assures that the characters in the window open with similar magnification as the first magnification rate while correcting for readability.

Warnock et al. sets forth a document viewing apparatus which provides a viewer with a zoomed and panned version of the document. The zooming and panning provides the document in an "article" format, where only the article of interest will be shown on the screen. This can be seen in Fig. 4c. The term "article" is used to denote a logically related and ordered portion of the information in the document. Warnock et al. further sets forth a scrolling means where the viewer can scroll through an article by way of threads linking different sections of the same article that are in different areas of the document. Additionally, Warnock et al. states that the article is zoomed and panned for better readability. The readability discussed by Warnock et al. is the presentment of the entire width of the article on the screen and the provision of scrolling through different sections of the article.

There are at least two fundamental differences between Warnock et al. and the claimed invention. The first fundamental



difference is that the presently claimed invention, as set forth in claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13, determines the magnification rate based on the preferences of both the viewer (the claimed first magnification rate) and the readability of the enlarged type in the window that the viewer specifies (the claimed size of said intended area as displayed on the screen, and the size assigned to said intended area to be enlarged on the screen).

Warnock et al., on the other hand, will always set the magnification rate and panning to produce the intended article in a specific viewing screen. There is **only one** magnification rate in Warnock et al., the rate that will produce the article as seen in Fig. 4c. The presently claimed invention recites that the invention is premised on displaying at least a character or an image in an enlarged form at a first designated magnification rate. Warnock et al., therefore, would only need one enlarged magnification rate, that which permits a viewing of an entire width of an article. The subject claims are different because they require a second magnification rate.

The article in Warnock et al. is zoomed and panned for better readability by zooming into the width of the article. The Office Action recites that this "readability" is shown in Warnock et al., in support of a conclusion of obviousness. We respectfully disagree with these determinations. The subject magnification rates are different than the magnification rate of Warnock et al., which zooms to produce the enlarged view of the



document, thus deriving a single magnification rate. Applicants, on the other hand, base the "zooming" on the first magnification rate of the previous **enlarged** characters, the size of the intended area as displayed on the screen, and the size assigned the said intended area to be enlarged.

Therefore, Warnock et al. fails to disclose a second magnification rate. Further, it would not be obvious to combine a second magnification rate with Warnock et al., because Warnock et al. only needs one magnification rate, the one magnification rate to zoom and pan the article to the proper width.

In view of the above clarifying amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13 be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Further, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to claims dependent from claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13, be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The second fundamental difference between Warnock et al. and Applicants' invention is that the subject scrolling prohibition is totally different than Warnock et al. In Warnock et al. the viewer performs uninterrupted reading of an article by scrolling through the article regardless of whether there is a physical separation between the sections of the article. Claims 9 and 14, on the other hand, **prohibit** further scrolling outside of the enlarged area, thus preventing the viewer from losing their position on the screen. Therefore, it would not have been



obvious to combine Applicants' type of scrolling with Warnock et al.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to claims 9 and 14 be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Further, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to the claims depending from claims 9 and 14 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

REJECTION BASED ON KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXAMINER:

The Office Action recites that the presently claimed type of scrolling is well known in the art, See page 15 lines 10-11. The Examiner is respectfully directed to 37 C.F.R. §104(d)(2), to wit:

When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claimed features are well known in the art, and requests from the Examiner either an affidavit or a reference which discloses the claimed scrolling feature. We do not believe that the claimed feature is well known in the art, and therefore would request that the rejections to claims 9 and 14 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.



Serial No.: 08/938,706

Docket No.: 122.1290/TEM/STB

CONCLUSION:

Accordingly, there being no other outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY, LLP

Date: 10/27/99

By: 

Todd E. Marlette

Registration No. 35,269

700 Eleventh Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501